Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/651,303	MORAN, DOUGLAS B.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ronald Baum	2136	<u> </u>
All Participants:	Status of Applicat	ion:	
(1) Ronald Baum.	(3)		
(2) <u>William J. James</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: <u>14 December 2004</u>	Time: <u>15:10</u>		
Type of Interview:  ☑ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic	cant's representative)	·	
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No If Yes, provide a brief description: .			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: 102(b); broadness of claims scope			
Claims discussed: 1,6,7,8,18,22,23			
Prior art documents discussed: n/a			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHA	AT WAS DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa</li> </ul>	ne examiner will provide record of the substance	e a written summary of the of the interview, since	the substance
			•
G. Mare			
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican	t/Applicant's Represent	ative Signature – if app	ropriate)

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Upon examiner reconsideration of applicants prior arguments (and subsequent amendments) in the remarks of 10/21/2004, the discussed claims 1,22,23 require limitations from dependent claims 6,7,8,18 (and associated similar claims, see examiner amendment). The examiner proposed appropriate changes via examiner amendment, into the claims that would sufficiently narrow the scope and distinguish the invention for allowance. Mr. James obtained the approval of the applicant, and confirming examiners proposed claim changes on 12/15/2004..